Art Unit: 3745

Response to Office Action

mailed 04/17/2006

Attorney Docket No.: 26218

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed April 17, 2006 in

connection with the above identified patent application. Prior to entry of this

amendment, claims 4 and 8 - 10 were pending in the application. By this

amendment, claim 8 has been amended.

In particular, it is to be noted that no new matter has been introduced

in amending the set of claims, since the amended set of claims contains only

limitations that were disclosed in the original specification.

In particular, support for amended claim 8 can be found for example in

Figure 2 of this application.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments introduce no

new matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 132.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 4 and 8 - 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as

being anticipated by Boeckel (US Patent No. 3,303,995); claims 8 - 10 have

been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Braun (US

Patent No. 4,583,911); and claims 4 and 8 - 10 have been rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Brackett (US Patent No. 4,838,760).

For a reference to anticipate an invention, all of the elements of that

invention must be present in the reference. The test for anticipation under

section 102 is whether each and every element as set forth in the claim is

found, either expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal

Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987);

Art Unit: 3745

Response to Office Action

mailed 04/17/2006

Attorney Docket No.: 26218

MPEP §2131. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail

as is contained in the claim. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d

1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); MPEP §2131.

Claim 8 has been amended. Applicant respectfully traverses the

Examiner's rejections because all of the elements of amended independent

claim 8 of the present invention are not present in the cited prior art.

The feature of amended claim 8 of the present invention is the

windows 25 formed in annular wall 13, and at peripheral edges where the

base wall and the annular wall connect, each placed in the gap between two

adjacent blades and between two adjacent reinforcing ribs having opposing

ends formed to connect at one end to the central portion of the base wall and

to connect at another end to the inner face of the annular wall. [Emphasis

added]. This arrangement provides more effective channeling of condensate

outward. Therefore, a ventilation unit 1 can be protected against infiltration by

water to safeguard electric motor 4 against damage.

With respect to amended claim 8, Boeckel, Braun, and Brackett fail to

disclose a number of through windows formed in the annular wall and at

peripheral edges where the base wall and the annular wall connect, each

placed in the gap between two adjacent blades and between two adjacent

reinforcing ribs. The references also fails to disclose a number of reinforcing

ribs having opposing ends formed to connect at one end to the central

portion of the base wall and to connect at another end to the inner face of the

annular wall as recited in amended claim 8.

Art Unit: 3745

Response to Office Action

mailed 04/17/2006

Attorney Docket No.: 26218

Boeckel discloses a fan motor cooling arrangement. A plurality of

circumferentially spaced apart openings 26 are adjacent the perimeter of end

wall 13 (similar to the annular wall of claim 8), but placed in the central hub

12 (similar to the base wall of claim 8). Additionally, the interior surface of the

end wall 13 within the chamber is provided with a plurality of radially

extending, straight centrifugal impeller vanes 28 (similar to the ribs of claim

8). See column 2, lines 32 - 45.

The configuration in Boeckel does not allow to channel out any

condensate formed inside the central body, without interfering with the

blades. The aim of the fan disclosed by Boeckel is simply cooling the fan

motor.

Further, the openings 26 in Boeckel may be formed adjacent to end

wall edge 13, but they are not formed in the annular wall and at peripheral

edges where the base wall and the annular wall connect. Nor are the

openings 26 each placed in the gap between two adjacent blades and

between two adjacent reinforcing ribs having opposing ends formed to

connect at one end to the central portion of the base wall and to connect at

another end to the inner face of the annular wall, to channel out any

condensate formed inside said central body.

Instead, in Boeckel, the openings 26 are formed in the hub 12 and the

vanes 28 are connected only at one end to the end wall 13.

Braun discloses a multiple fluid pathway energy converter. Braun

discloses an edge 24 (similar to annular wall of claim 8) of the hub 16 to

which blades 18 are mounted and containing a plurality of edge orifices 26.

Art Unit: 3745

Response to Office Action

mailed 04/17/2006

Attorney Docket No.: 26218

Edge orifices 26 communicate with face orifices 22 located in face 20 of the

hub 16. See column 3, lines 4 - 34. This configuration does not allow to

channel out any condensate formed inside the central body, without

interfering with the blades.

Braun also discloses internal hub ribs 60 (similar to ribs of claim 8)

extending radially between the portion of the hub 16 supporting the drive

shaft 28 and the edge 24. See column 7, lines 13 - 26.

The orifices 26 in Braun may be formed in edge 24, but they are not

formed in the annular wall and at peripheral edges where the base wall and

the annular wall connect. Nor are the orifices 26 each placed in the gap

between two adjacent blades and between two adjacent reinforcing ribs

having opposing ends formed to connect at one end to the central portion of

the base wall and to connect at another end to the inner face of the annular

wall to channel out any condensate formed inside said central body.

Instead, in Braun, the orifices 26 and the orifices 22 are formed at a

location away from the peripheral edge where the edge 24 and face 20

(similar to base wall of claim 8) connect.

Brackett discloses a fan with a motor cooling enhancement. Cup-

shaped hub 20 (similar to base wall of claim 8) includes a central member 26

and a cylindrical extending wall 28 (similar to annular wall of claim 8). A

plurality of fan blades 30 radially extend from wall 28. The wall 28 further

includes at least one opening 40 between adjacent fan blades 30. Means for

inducing the axial flow of air through the openings includes a first plurality of

arcuately shaped first webs 44. The hub further includes a second plurality of

Art Unit: 3745

Response to Office Action

mailed 04/17/2006

Attorney Docket No.: 26218

webs 70 parallel to the inclination of the top 54 of the first webs 44. See

column 1, line 56 to column 3, line 3. The first and second webs are similar to

ribs in claim 8.

The configuration in Brackett does not allow to channel out any

condensate formed inside the central body, without interfering with the

blades. The openings 40 in Brackett may be formed in wall 28, but they are

not each placed in the gap between two adjacent blades and between two

adjacent reinforcing ribs having opposing ends formed to connect at one end

to the central portion of the base wall and to connect at another end to the

inner face of the annular wall, to channel out any condensate formed inside

said central body.

Instead, in Brackett, some of the webs 44 are connect only at one end

to inner portion 50 of wall 28.

Therefore, each and every feature of amended independent claim 8,

namely, is not disclosed by any of the cited references.

Moreover, dependent claims 4, 9, and 10 (reciting features regarding

the spacing of the blades and the reinforcing ribs, respectively), which are

dependent on claim 8, are also believed to be allowable for at least similar

reasons.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of

the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Art Unit: 3745

Response to Office Action

mailed 04/17/2006

Attorney Docket No.: 26218

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicant petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-0112.

Respectfully submitted, NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC

Date: July 13, 2006

NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC 112 South West Street

Alexandria, VA 22314 Tel. (703) 548-6284 Fax. (703) 683-8396 Gary M. Nath Registration No. 26,965 Gregory B. Kang Registration No. 45,273 Teresa M. Arroyo Registration No. 50,015 Customer No. 20529